

it by any save the few technical opportunities of the times. To commence hand for such an undertaking the necessary books, and native? The very scholarship is so limited of print would include such men as Messrs Ma Parkes, or Hart, among the few who are not of the missionary community, but even if they have the close community work many works have been in Chinese language by us as no work upon so much each be said to possess among it the while was safely asserted that it even relatively, occupied the pupil as one of the German grammars. The better class works by Mr Wade require self resource to be while many others are useless. The very first a good series of books. But suppose these of colloquial is almost inability under foreign lips of a native Chinese tonation be learned and important singular language. The Chinese colloquial teachers would there far more so even to With the amount of bestowed upon the Chinese undoubtedly found to pay the salary competent natives, any scheme intended must almost inevitably do not think that the cause of education at home for some much might be done na. Here we have it with all the impossibility may be made useful Chinese institute was Why should not Hong in this way? The college partially supported for the benefit of the Chinese, and partial from outsiders desirous of its advancement, a thoroughly qualified must be placed at the resident missionary would willingly conduct lessons and the scheme while the subsidized Chinese school be secured as they organized establishment the interests of China.

Great Britain is nation with large China, of which afforded no public for of the Chinese. Lord Russell of Ackland holds proper to hold comparatively small single chair, the pounds per annum. It is evident that a qualified teacher is not only and not only it may be hoped it is almost superfluous necessity of acquiring capable man. If attention to the community at large a China "opened up" among it themselves native in their own are made of the teachers are subjected to the boys, could being usually do hardly any one learn the language the natives direct be the best of China the dominion not once our language the barbarous pidgin forms the only medium between the two many, but that far houseboys, comprising dealings with quite useless in ders. If the young community devote but a very time to the study of the misunderstanding between the two disappear.

GOVERNMENT

The difficulty of finding interpreters living between the governed and more and more three gentlemen and three others, fluency, but the which secured for appointments in are the causes removal and prominent pests. If young men who the ordeal of an and whose end service was to their abilities to der government, main as interpreters their career in a prospect held of official office. It is they are sent out place of these appointments who, understanding the language, would advantage to purely Chinese

ave must remain there, constituted false in
on imprisonment. But that kind of false impr

sonment was only a misdemeanor. All that the prosecution could have in such case to prove would be the fact of imprisonment. It would be for the defendant to show that he was justified in what he did, and that the imprisonment was lawful. The question therefore for the jury to decide was very simple so far. But the Attorney General had suggested, in the first count on which the prisoners had been indicted, that this was not simply a case of false imprisonment; but that, more than that, it came within one of the statutes provided in this colony, and the Attorney General indicted the prisoners for imprisonment "with intent to sell." If a person was really detained against his will with such an intent, then the imprisonment would be a felony. Then came, therefore, the question, did the prisoners, or any of them, intend to sell Chin a Lin? With regard to intent, the law said that it must be derived from the act, and that the jury would have to draw their own inference in this case. If they found that the act had been accompanied by such other circumstances as would lead to the conclusion that the act pointed to the end and intent charged, then, if they believed the woman was detained against her will—though there was no evidence that there had been a sale—it would be for the jury to say on their consciences, did they believe this imprisonment was, or was not, for the purposes of gain? His Honor read the evidence in the ordinance creating the offence under the first count, and continued. There were two points for the jury to consider: Did the mode of imprisonment prevent the woman going at large at her will? If they said that it did—and the defence had not suggested any lawful ground of imprisonment—then, if they believed the woman was imprisoned for any period, they would find a verdict of guilty on the first count, if they believed the prisoners did intend to sell the woman. And then, if they did so intend to sell, the jury would consider whether it was from a motive of great benevolence that the woman was taken into the house and kept there for her own benefit, or with some other intent. That was for the jury to decide. They must say, was the woman detained from pure benevolence to benefit her, or were the prisoners prompted by that selfish benevolence to which human nature is prone, and acted to benefit themselves. His Honor reviewed the evidence in relation to this point, and generally. He complimented Mr. Tommochy on the energy and discretion that gentleman had shown, and directed the jury that they might rely on his evidence implicitly. They had found a paper in Mr. Tommochy's hand up outside the door of the house, where prisoners and the women were. (His Honor read a translation to the effect that persons inside that house must obey regulations, must embark on board the *Portland* at proper time, that persons entering the house must not go out as they liked, &c.) If the jury could not connect the prisoners with this paper, then the case must be dismissed, but as he said, Mr. Tommochy's evidence was clear. The same witness also said that licenses for emigration purposes were issuable by him under proper regulations. He asked prisoners for their license, and they produced a piece of paper with English print upon it. Now was that paper an authority by means of which these prisoners could keep an emigrant here? He would read it. "Bygones of these have been employed to collect emigrants for the Kwong-tung-fat Company at Hongkong." Well, what sort of Company? Was it a commercial company, or a benevolent company, such as in England would be regarded as such? The jury would draw their own inferences from the evidence. Then this paper went on. "The emigrants are to be shipped at Hongkong under the provision of the local Government and the Dutch Consuls, and to proceed to Dutch Guiana, where they will be well treated. Having formerly been living in the Sunon and Kweishin Districts, I certify this to be the truth." Mr. Lobscheid, Victoria, Hongkong, 22nd September, 1866." So that (continued His Honor) the only authority under which these people emigrate is a license from Lobscheid. That is not a license. The charge of imprisonment was made—first indirectly—by the women in the house directly they saw a man to whom they could speak. They said, "we have been brought here under false pretences." They said this in the presence of the prisoners. Why, if such an assertion had been false, did not the prisoners speak out? Suppose such an assertion had been made by a person in the house of one of the jury, what would the jurymen have said? Why he would have said "go about your business." "Have you received any money?" Mr. Tommochy asked the women. They said they had not. Even upon this question the prisoners maintained silence. No witness had been produced for the defence to show that relief had been done in that house, was justified by law or practice in this colony. Mr. Baynard had presented the facts in the most favorable light for the prisoners, but, as has been said, the jury must draw their own inferences. It was said that the prisoners were ignorant men, but were they not in a station of life that would lead one to suppose they worked for gain? It was for the jury to say whether they believed the prisoners worked in this case for gain or not. If they believed the witnesses, they must arrive at the conclusion that there had been unlawful restraint on the person. His Honor said he would not occupy the time of the jury uselessly, but he thought that the important nature of the case would relieve him from any suspicion of having intruded on their time unnecessarily.

The papers in the case were then handed to the jury, who retired, and in a few minutes returned into court with a verdict of guilty on the second count. Two of the jury had desired to return a verdict of guilty on the first count.

His Honor—Have the prisoners anything to say?

The Interpreter put the question and replied: They all say they were employed by other men, my lord.

His Honor: The best excuse you can offer for yourselves is, that others were engaged in this transaction, who could have better filled your places at the bar. Every one must have known that you were doing wrong, and committing a breach of the law. The evidence against your manner when you were challenged by Mr. Tommochy showed that you had doubts as to whether what you were about was right. Enough has come out in this case for me to see that you knew you were committing a great breach of the natural duties of man, and that in keeping this woman in prison you knew you were committing a breach of moral and legal right.

I shut out—properly or improperly—from this case, evidence which however I have looked at, and which gives such a character to your objects, as to make me certain that you knew you were doing wrong. However, the jury have taken one of two alternatives before them, and I have no doubt they exercised their best discretion. It is my business now to punish you on the offence of which they have found you guilty; but I can only say that if the jury had found you guilty on the first count of the larger offence of imprisoning with the view of selling these people, you would have been very severely punished indeed. The sentence of the Court is that each of you be imprisoned for the period of twelve calendar months.

The Attorney General after generally going over the case called the principal witness:

Mrs Lucy Jane Howes, who appeared to be suffering considerably from the severe shock to which she has been so cruelly subjected; she was accompanied with a chair. Mrs Howes having been sworn made the following statement, which notwithstanding her evident weakness, was given throughout in a clear and steady tone of voice. It may also be remarked that the prisoner bore the same sleepy cast of countenance, as perceived on his several former appearances at the previous enquiries before the Magistrate. Mrs Howes proceeded to state that she was widow of the late Captain P. Howes, late master of the American schooner *Lubra*, in which vessel the witness left Hongkong on the 21st September last bound for Japan. The crew consisted of 1st and 2d mates, and five sailors, Europeans, there were also on board a cook and steward, both of whom were Chinese. They proceeded on their voyage, on Sunday the 23rd inst. at 10 o'clock, about half past six in the evening and got out of sight of land. Had a general cargo on board, including arms and ammunition. Witness was on deck about half past six in the evening and noticed a small junk bearing down on them, and when within speaking distance some one hailed them in English from the junk, as to whether they required a pilot, after which the junk came alongside and commenced a discharge of muskets, witness having gone below previously to hearing the shots. Witness noticed a man at the mast head of the junk. The mate, master, officers, and all the crew were on deck, when witness went below, they being all unarmed at that time. Witness was followed to the cabin by her late husband and about a dozen Chinese entered the same time. Could recognize two of the Chinese. The prisoner at the bar is one of them. He spoke in very good English at the time, and gave them to understand that he was the captain, saying that he "had got 25 pieces cooly, they make kill you" if they did not give up the gold and opium. The prisoner said "you have got gold and opium, the gold belongs to you meaning her late husband, the master," replied that he had got no opium or gold in the ship. Prisoner replied "you have got one piece cooly man on board, you told him there was both articles in the ship." The prisoner offered to release the ship, if the gold and opium were produced, but told them they must proceed on their voyage to Japan, or if they did not, they would all be killed. Prisoner not being satisfied with the captain's assurance, the prisoner had no search the vessel.

Prisoners and the others were armed with pistols, boarding-pikes and swords. Two or three of the men remained after the prisoner left and searched the cabin, ransacking all the boxes, taking gold and some odd money, also a little jewellery. The prisoner returned shortly afterwards, and again demanded gold and opium. Witness and her husband denied that there was any on board. Prisoner, threatened to kill the witness and her husband and child. The cabin was again searched, by the order of the prisoner who with three or four more remained down below for that purpose; but in half an hour they went on deck, leaving an armed man to guard the door. Prisoner returned for a third time with several of his men, who were all armed, and seized both her late husband and witness, and attempted to drag him up on deck. This was done by order of the prisoner. Witness was kept apart from her husband by two men, with drawn swords. The prisoner made some remark to his companions, and waved his hand, the prisoner following his men on deck. Her husband at this time was standing near the door. Witness was not troubled by the pirates after this. The prisoner came down about 12 o'clock at night, and said "no make ready we go away." He fastened the cabin door back. Previously to this a musket had been pointed at witness from the deck door. Prisoner did not see the face of the man that pointed the gun at her. Immediately afterwards witness heard the report of a gun. Witness was standing near the door, the ball entering his eye and causing instantaneous death. Prisoner would hardly have time to get up the gangway, from the time he left the cabin, to when the shot was fired. The master never moved after being shot. Witness saw some of the cargo of the *Lubra* being removed to the junk. The two rifles now in Court are similar to some on board, which formed part of the cargo of the *Lubra* at the time of the attack. The prisoner came down into the cabin immediately after my husband was shot, and held a lighted candle towards the face of the captain, and then passed it before my face. He then placed it on a table. Witness asked him to shoot her. Prisoner made no reply and left the cabin. Witness returned to Hongkong the next day, Monday the 24th. When witness went on deck all the pirates had left. This was about ten minutes after the prisoner went on deck from the cabin. This

THE LUBRA PIRACY.

The following jurors were sworn: Messrs J. A. Brook, F. A. Lane, G. R. Laumert, Z. Barton, L. Mallory, J. Welkie and Koch.

Leong sam kit, the supposed murderer of the late Capt. P. Howes, was placed in the dock, this day and charged by the Attorney General with piracy and murder, on the high seas, on the 23rd September last.

After being arraigned on the above charges, the prisoner pleaded not guilty. The circumstances of the case were laid by the Attorney General before the jury, which, however, must be still fresh in the memory of every resident in Hongkong, having been so lately reported during the different preliminary enquiries at the Police Court.

The Attorney General after generally going over the case called the principal witness:

Mrs Lucy Jane Howes, who appeared to be suffering considerably from the severe shock to which she has been so cruelly subjected; she was accompanied with a chair. Mrs Howes having been sworn made the following statement, which notwithstanding her evident weakness, was given throughout in a clear and steady tone of voice. It may also be remarked that the prisoner bore the same sleepy cast of countenance, as perceived on his several former appearances at the previous enquiries before the Magistrate. Mrs Howes proceeded to state that she was widow of the late Captain P. Howes, late master of the American schooner *Lubra*, in which vessel the witness left Hongkong on the 21st September last bound for Japan. The crew consisted of 1st and 2d mates, and five sailors, Europeans, there were also on board a cook and steward, both of whom were Chinese. They proceeded on their voyage, on Sunday the 23rd inst. at 10 o'clock, about half past six in the evening and got out of sight of land. Had a general cargo on board, including arms and ammunition. Witness was on deck about half past six in the evening and noticed a small junk bearing down on them, and when within speaking distance some one hailed them in English from the junk, as to whether they required a pilot, after which the junk came alongside and commenced a discharge of muskets, witness having gone below previously to hearing the shots. Witness noticed a man at the mast head of the junk. The mate, master, officers, and all the crew were on deck, when witness went below, they being all unarmed at that time. Witness was followed to the cabin by her late husband and about a dozen Chinese entered the same time. Could recognize two of the Chinese. The prisoner at the bar is one of them. He spoke in very good English at the time, and gave them to understand that he was the captain, saying that he "had got 25 pieces cooly, they make kill you" if they did not give up the gold and opium. The prisoner said "you have got gold and opium, the gold belongs to you meaning her late husband, the master," replied that he had got no opium or gold in the ship. Prisoner replied "you have got one piece cooly man on board, you told him there was both articles in the ship." The prisoner offered to release the ship, if the gold and opium were produced, but told them they must proceed on their voyage to Japan, or if they did not, they would all be killed. Prisoner not being satisfied with the captain's assurance, the prisoner had no search the vessel.

Prisoners and the others were armed with pistols, boarding-pikes and swords. Two or three of the men remained after the prisoner left and searched the cabin, ransacking all the boxes, taking gold and some odd money, also a little jewellery. The prisoner returned shortly afterwards, and again demanded gold and opium. Witness and her husband denied that there was any on board. Prisoner, threatened to kill the witness and her husband and child. The cabin was again searched, by the order of the prisoner who with three or four more remained down below for that purpose; but in half an hour they went on deck, leaving an armed man to guard the door. Prisoner returned for a third time with several of his men, who were all armed, and seized both her late husband and witness, and attempted to drag him up on deck. This was done by order of the prisoner. Witness was kept apart from her husband by two men, with drawn swords. The prisoner made some remark to his companions, and waved his hand, the prisoner following his men on deck. Her husband at this time was standing near the door. Witness was not troubled by the pirates after this. The prisoner came down about 12 o'clock at night, and said "no make ready we go away." He fastened the cabin door back. Previously to this a musket had been pointed at witness from the deck door. Prisoner did not see the face of the man that pointed the gun at her. Immediately afterwards witness heard the report of a gun. Witness was standing near the door, the ball entering his eye and causing instantaneous death. Prisoner would hardly have time to get up the gangway, from the time he left the cabin, to when the shot was fired. The master never moved after being shot. Witness saw some of the cargo of the *Lubra* being removed to the junk. The two rifles now in Court are similar to some on board, which formed part of the cargo of the *Lubra* at the time of the attack. The prisoner came down into the cabin immediately after my husband was shot, and held a lighted candle towards the face of the captain, and then passed it before my face. He then placed it on a table. Witness asked him to shoot her. Prisoner made no reply and left the cabin. Witness returned to Hongkong the next day, Monday the 24th. When witness went on deck all the pirates had left. This was about ten minutes after the prisoner went on deck from the cabin. This

was about midnight. Witness some time since went to Victoria Gaol and identified the prisoner as the man she has now been relating about. Witness picked him out directly, it was the first time she had seen him since the attack.

By the Judge—Witness now has not the slightest doubt about the prisoner being the man who spoke to her on board the *Lubra*.

This concluded the evidence of Mr. Howes, and the prisoner asking no questions the Attorney General called

Lucy-ching, who being declared stated she was a boat woman of Macao. Witness recognized the two muskets now in Court. Witness purchased them on the 8th of October last, from the prisoner at the bar. Prisoner produced from his boat whilst they were lying on alongside the *Praya Grande* at Macao. Witness gave the prisoner \$2 each for them. Witness was induced to buy them because they were cheap. Witness arrived in Hongkong on the 5th of November. Witness was taken to Victoria Gaol where she pointed out the prisoner from amongst several other men.

Prisoner asked no questions. The Attorney General next called Hermano Arpenovich, who stated that he was a clerk of Messrs. Landstein & Co., of Stanley Street, and is aware that Messrs. Landstein & Co., shipped on board the *Lubra*, which vessel was dispatched on the 22nd by witness, some cases of long and short Enfield. On the return of the *Lubra* to Hongkong on the 25th September, some of the cases had been opened, and the rifles removed, which Enfield. The empty cases contained on the vessel's return to Hongkong had contained some of the rifles shipped by us before she left. None of the long Enfields were found on examination to be missing. Witness examined the two rifles now in Court, they are marked by a crown with the Tower mark 1866, the rifles have also five grooves and are short Enfields. Witness can state certainly the rifles are similar in every respect to those shipped by us.

In answer to the Judge, Witness has seen other rifles in Hongkong precisely similar to those in Court.

Denis Daly being next called stated that he is an Inspector of police, and that from information received by him, he applied to the Police Magistrate for a warrant, and proceeded therewith accompanied by a Chinaman on the 12th of the present month on board a cargo and passenger steamer, the *Wanchai*, which the Chinaman pointed out the prisoner, and witness at once arrested him. The Chinaman had formerly been employed at the Police Court as interpreter.

This witness closed the case for the crown. The prisoner, who was undefended by counsel, merely in a few words denied the whole statements made by the different witnesses for the prosecution, and asserted that he had never been in Hongkong before in his life until the day he was arrested, he having come to Hongkong to be present at a wedding.

Before commencing the summing up, the judge would like to know what had become of the *Lubra* and her crew, and Mr. Abernethy was recalled, who stated that a new Captain had been appointed, and she sailed hence about three weeks after her return to Hongkong, and to the best of his belief all the crew sailed with her. The value of the rifles wholesale in Hongkong is about \$12 each, and they were not obtainable, he was under the impression, at the present time in this place.

His Honor commenced to sum up at three p.m. In the course of his speech His Honor pointed out to the jury that where loss of life had resulted in any persons banding together, while engaged in a robbery, and that was immaterial who struck the fatal blow, or drew the trigger; all present were equally liable for what was done. His Honor then drew attention to the fact that from the position of the vessel no doubt existed that actual piracy was committed. His Honor also commended the manner in which Mrs Howes had given her testimony, and the firmness with which she had gone through the whole of the affair. His Honor remarked that the evidence was short, and clear, but it was for the jury to decide whether the evidence proved murder. It was of course possible for the prisoner to have taken the gun from the man on deck, and fired the shot which killed the master, and the circumstance of the prisoner coming down with the candle after the deed had been done, this gave the first witness an opportunity to interrogate the prisoner on her mind, and His Honor remarked that it was highly satisfactory that Mrs Howes had been able to give on every point such corroborative testimony, at this length of time, after the occurrence. It was for the jury to consider whether, after they had heard the evidence of Mrs Howes, given as it was in the clear manner, that the evidence in the identity of the prisoner could be discovered, in that lady's evidence. His Honor carefully read through whole of the evidence, and copiously commented thereon, reminding the jury that if they believed the witness had sworn truly, no doubt could exist in their minds. They were not responsible for the doings of others, but that, to perform a certain duty, release from all responsibility, for actions of others. His Honor concluded summing up at half past three, when the jury retired to consider their verdict, returning into the box after an absence of ten minutes, and recorded after some slight hesitation on the part of one of the jurors, when after some explanation from the court, he however waived his scruples, when a unanimous verdict of guilty of piracy and murder was recorded.

The judge, having assumed in the identity of the prisoner could be discovered, in that lady's evidence. His Honor carefully read through whole of the evidence, and copiously commented thereon, reminding the jury that if they believed the witness had sworn truly, no doubt could exist in their minds. They were not responsible for the doings of others, but that, to perform a certain duty, release from all responsibility, for actions of others. His Honor concluded summing up at half past three, when the jury retired to consider their verdict, returning into the box after an absence of ten minutes, and recorded after some slight hesitation on the part of one of the jurors, when after some explanation from the court, he however waived his scruples, when a unanimous verdict of guilty of piracy and murder was recorded.

From the opening statement of the Attorney General it appeared that the act of which the prisoner stood charged as one of the participants therein, was perpetrated in December last, on board a junk called

the Quong-che-cheong, belonging to Sokewan, from which place she sailed on the 20th December last, and has never been heard of or seen since that time. The junk, a family one, was owned by one named Quok in Shan, all of whom were on board at the time of the attack, and as it is asserted by the survivors, that all were thrown overboard and four of them were drowned. The prisoner's connection with the affair as stated by the crown, being that he was well known at Sokewan as a sailor on board the junk at the time she left, which the prisoner denies, stating himself to be a barber at Sokewan, where after a long absence, he had returned and been immediately recognized, and given into custody by the surviving members of the junk's occupants, who had returned to Sokewan.

The Attorney General first called Quok-a-cun, who being declared, said that she was a fishing boat woman, at Sokewan, and was a boatwoman on the 20th December last on board a boat with her father Quok in Shan, at Sokewan. That boat was on board at the time her father, mother, and six children, also two brothers in law. On the 20th December the boat left Stanley, to go out fishing. Her mother's name was Chow-a-lock. A boy named Quok-a-yong, aged 13, who was betrothed to her sister, another boy named Quok-a-tye, aged 7, also betrothed to another sister, and a girl named Amoy, aged three years, were with her. Witness also knew Quok-a-sing, who is ten years of age, he was also on board, altogether seven persons. Quok-hoy-kee is her brother. Witness knows Leong-a-cheoy, she is the wife of her brother. Witness did not see either him or his wife on board when the junk started fishing from Stanley. There were on board a crew of five men who left with them. The prisoner was one of the five men, his name was Apoo, but she does not know his surname. Witness had known the prisoner previously since August 1865. He was employed up to the 20th December as steersman, on board her father's boat. The boat left Stanley late in the afternoon, in company with another boat. Witness knows Lum-tu-chin, he was a boatman on board the boat in company. Her father's boat being a fast sailer soon left the other boat astern. The prisoner was requested by the father by what means not to go far ahead. At that time they had lost sight of the other boat, it being then between six and seven o'clock and getting dark, no land being in view. The prisoner, on being expostulated with by her father, struck him. The boat was steering west at the time with a fair strong breeze. Witness could see her father struck by the prisoner, who threw an iron bar at him, and afterwards the rest of the crew rushed on deck, striking him with the windlass bars and knocking him down on the deck. The mother of witness named Cho-lok, went up to the men, and begged them not to beat her husband, but was likewise beaten. Both her father and mother were killed and thrown overboard. Her brothers Quok-a-yow and A-tye were under the main hatch. Witness was so close to her father and mother when they were lying on the deck, that she could touch them. The prisoner and the other four men then threw them both overboard. That was directly after they were beaten down, she heard her father say, as he was being dragged along, "I will give up all, do not throw me overboard." Her mother also said something, but she was dragged away and thrown overboard, the prisoner assisting the others. Ayow and A-tye, who had both run away to the water. Witness saw the prisoner throw one of the children overboard. Witness and the infant, with Quok-a-sing her brother, locked themselves up in the cabin. Witness remained in the cabin for a day and night, when they were landed at a place called Chappoo, an island to the westward of the Lamma. Witness went to Chappoo, where she saw some relatives, and then made a complaint to the authorities. Witness remained at Macao till the new year when her brother Quok-hoy arrived. After witness left Chappoo she did not see the prisoner again until he was arrested at Sokewan. The prisoner was on board the junk to Chappoo, which she has never seen since nor either her father, mother, or brothers. They were all thrown overboard. Witness was employed as a boatwoman or board her father's boat.

By the Judge.—Witness and her brother remained in the cabin during the passage to Chappoo. Quok-a-sing was in the main hold at the time her parents were thrown overboard.

This witness, who appeared to be about sixteen years of age, gave her testimony in a very satisfactory manner and without much difficulty or hesitation.

The prisoner asked no questions of the witness, and the Attorney General next called Quok-a-sing, aged ten, a very small child, whose chin hardly reached the bar of the witness box, but who appeared to be very intelligent for his class, having been duly declared, stated that he was betrothed to one of his sisters in law, who was thrown overboard. Witness then withdrew, after a hesitation pointed out the prisoner, as one of the crew on board at the time of the murder. The last time he saw his father's junk was about the Chinese year. The prisoner was on board the boat when she left Stanley in October 1865. The two old people of the Quok family, "we call them father and mother," also Ayow A-tye, an infant two years of age, and himself. The last witness, himself, and an infant, only when in company with a boat called the Quok-in-shan. Witness knows the prisoner, he belonged to the crew of that boat, and saw him then on board. Prisoner had been known to witness for several months previously to the 20th December. The boats were out of sight of each other at dusk. Witness has never seen the Quok-in-shan boat since that day.

By the Judge.—Witness had not been on board the Quok-in-shan boat that morning. He knew that the family were on board. The Master and wife and the children, were with five of the crew on board. The witness recognizes the prisoner as one of them.

Monday, 26th November, 1866.

PIRACY AND MURDER.

The following jurors having been sworn, viz. Messrs. J. A. Brook, D. Davidson, A. L. Turner, H. Kears, Geo. Inglis, Paul Keketo, and Oldach.

Low-kun-poo, was placed in the dock, and charged by the Attorney General with piracy and murder of certain persons committed on board a junk at sea, and to which charge the prisoner pleaded not guilty. The prisoner who appeared somewhat nervous, was undefended by counsel.

From the opening statement of the Attorney General it appeared that the act of which the prisoner stood charged as one of the participants therein, was perpetrated in December last, on board a junk called

the Quong-che-cheong, belonging to Sokewan, from which place she sailed on the 20th December last, and has never been heard of or seen since that time. The junk, a family one, was owned by one named Quok in Shan, all of whom were on board at the time of the attack, and as it is asserted by the survivors, that all were thrown overboard and four of them were drowned. The prisoner's connection with the affair as stated by the crown, being that he was well known at Sokewan as a sailor on board the junk at the time she left, which the prisoner denies, stating himself to be a barber at Sokewan, where after a long absence, he had returned and been immediately recognized, and given into custody by the surviving members of the junk's occupants, who had returned to Sokewan.

The Attorney General first called Quok-a-cun, who being declared, said that she was a fishing boat woman, at Sokewan, and was a boatwoman on the 20th December last on board a boat with her father Quok in Shan, at Sokewan. That boat was on board at the time her father, mother, and six children, also two brothers in law. On the 20th December the boat left Stanley, to go out fishing. Her mother's name was Chow-a-lock. A boy named Quok-a-yong, aged 13, who was betrothed to her sister, another boy named Quok-a-tye, aged 7, also betrothed to another sister, and a girl named Amoy, aged three years, were with her. Witness also knew Quok-a-sing, who is ten years of age, he was also on board, altogether seven persons. Quok-hoy-kee is her brother. Witness knows Leong-a-cheoy, she is the wife of her brother. Witness did not see either him or his wife on board when the junk started fishing from Stanley. There were on board a crew of five men who left with them. The prisoner was one of the five men, his name was Apoo, but she does not know his surname. Witness had known the prisoner previously since August 1865. He was employed up to the 20th December as steersman, on board her father's boat. The boat left Stanley late in the afternoon, in company with another boat. Witness knows Lum-tu-chin, he was a boatman on board the boat in company. Her father's boat being a fast sailer soon left the other boat astern. The prisoner was requested by the father by what means not to go far ahead. At that time they had lost sight of the other boat, it being then between six and seven o'clock and getting dark, no land being in view. The prisoner, on being expostulated with by her father, struck him. The boat was steering west at the time with a fair strong breeze. Witness could see her father struck by the prisoner, who threw an iron bar at him, and afterwards the rest of the crew rushed on deck, striking him with the windlass bars and knocking him down on the deck. The mother of witness named Cho-lok, went up to the men, and begged them not to beat her husband, but was likewise beaten. Both her father and mother were killed and thrown overboard. Her brothers Quok-a-yow and A-tye were under the main hatch. Witness was so close to her father and mother when they were lying on the deck, that she could touch them. The prisoner and the other four men then threw them both overboard. That was directly after they were beaten down, she heard her father say, as he was being dragged along, "I will give up all, do not throw me overboard." Her mother also said something, but she was dragged away and thrown overboard, the prisoner assisting the others. Ayow and A-tye, who had both run away to the water. Witness saw the prisoner throw one of the children overboard. Witness and the infant, with Quok-a-sing her brother, locked themselves up in the cabin. Witness remained in the cabin for a day and night, when they were landed at a place called Chappoo, an island to the westward of the Lamma. Witness went to Chappoo, where she saw some relatives, and then made a complaint to the authorities. Witness remained at Macao till the new year when her brother Quok-hoy arrived. After witness left Chappoo she did not see the prisoner again until he was arrested at Sokewan. The prisoner was on board the junk to Chappoo, which she has never seen since nor either her father, mother, or brothers. They were all thrown overboard. Witness was employed as a boatwoman or board her father's boat.

the Quong-che-cheong, belonging to Sokewan, from which place she sailed on the 20th December last, and has never been heard of or seen since that time. The junk, a family one, was owned by one named Quok in Shan, all of whom were on board at the time of the attack, and as it is asserted by the survivors, that all were thrown overboard and four of them were drowned. The prisoner's connection with the affair as stated by the crown, being that he was well known at Sokewan as a sailor on board the junk at the time she left, which the prisoner denies, stating himself to be a barber at Sokewan, where after a long absence, he had returned and been immediately recognized, and given into custody by the surviving members of the junk's occupants, who had returned to Sokewan.

The Attorney General first called Quok-a-cun, who being declared, said that she was a fishing boat woman, at Sokewan, and was a boatwoman on the 20th December last on board a boat with her father Quok in Shan, at Sokewan. That boat was on board at the time her father, mother, and six children, also two brothers in law. On the 20th December the boat left Stanley, to go out fishing. Her mother's name was Chow-a-lock. A boy named Quok-a-yong, aged 13, who was betrothed to her sister, another boy named Quok-a-tye, aged 7, also betrothed to another sister, and a girl named Amoy, aged three years, were with her. Witness also knew Quok-a-sing, who is ten years of age, he was also on board, altogether seven persons. Quok-hoy-kee is her brother. Witness knows Leong-a-cheoy, she is the wife of her brother. Witness did not see either him or his wife on board when the junk started fishing from Stanley. There were on board a crew of five men who left with them. The prisoner was one of the five men, his name was Apoo, but she does not know his surname. Witness had known the prisoner previously since August 1865. He was employed up to the 20th December as steersman, on board her father's boat. The boat left Stanley late in the afternoon, in company with another boat. Witness knows Lum-tu-chin, he was a boatman on board the boat in company. Her father's boat being a fast sailer soon left the other boat astern. The prisoner was requested by the father by what means not to go far ahead. At that time they had lost sight of the other boat, it being then between six and seven o'clock and getting dark, no land being in view. The prisoner, on being expostulated with by her father, struck him. The boat was steering west at the time with a fair strong breeze. Witness could see her father struck by the prisoner, who threw an iron bar at him, and afterwards the rest of the crew rushed on deck, striking him with the windlass bars and knocking him down on the deck. The mother of witness named Cho-lok, went up to the men, and begged them not to beat her husband, but was likewise beaten. Both her father and mother were killed and thrown overboard. Her brothers Quok-a-yow and A-tye were under the main hatch. Witness was so close to her father and mother when they were lying on the deck, that she could touch them. The prisoner and the other four men then threw them both overboard. That was directly after they were beaten down, she heard her father say, as he was being dragged along, "I will give up all, do not throw me overboard." Her mother also said something, but she was dragged away and thrown overboard, the prisoner assisting the others. Ayow and A-tye, who had both run away to the water. Witness saw the prisoner throw one of the children overboard. Witness and the infant, with Quok-a-sing her brother, locked themselves up in the cabin. Witness remained in the cabin for a day and night, when they were landed at a place called Chappoo, an island to the westward of the Lamma. Witness went to Chappoo, where she saw some relatives, and then made a complaint to the authorities. Witness remained at Macao till the new year when her brother Quok-hoy arrived. After witness left Chappoo she did not see the prisoner again until he was arrested at Sokewan. The prisoner was on board the junk to Chappoo, which she has never seen since nor either her father, mother, or brothers. They were all thrown overboard. Witness was employed as a boatwoman or board her father's boat.

By the Judge.—Witness and her brother remained in the cabin during the passage to Chappoo. Quok-a-sing was in the main hold at the time her parents were thrown overboard.

This witness, who appeared to be about sixteen years of age, gave her testimony in a very satisfactory manner and without much difficulty or hesitation.

The prisoner asked no questions of the witness, and the Attorney General next called Quok-a-sing, aged ten, a very small child, whose chin hardly reached the bar of the witness box, but who appeared to be very intelligent for his class, having been duly declared, stated that he was betrothed to one of his sisters in law, who was thrown overboard. Witness then withdrew, after a hesitation pointed out the prisoner, as one of the crew on board at the time of the murder. The last time he saw his father's junk was about the Chinese year. The prisoner was on board the boat when she left Stanley in October 1865. The two old people of the Quok family, "we call them father and mother," also Ayow A-tye, an infant two years of age, and himself. The last witness, himself, and an infant, only when in company with a boat called the Quok-in-shan. Witness knows the prisoner, he belonged to the crew of that boat, and saw him then on board. Prisoner had been known to witness for several months previously to the 20th December. The boats were out of sight of each other at dusk. Witness has never seen the Quok-in-shan boat since that day.

By the Judge.—Witness had not been on board the Quok-in-shan boat that morning. He knew that the family were on board. The Master and wife and the children, were with five of the crew on board. The witness recognizes the prisoner as one of them.

the Quong-che-cheong, belonging to Sokewan, from which place she sailed on the 20th December last, and has never been heard of or seen since that time. The junk, a family one, was owned by one named Quok in Shan, all of whom were on board at the time of the attack, and as it is asserted by the survivors, that all were thrown overboard and four of them were drowned. The prisoner's connection with the affair as stated by the crown, being that he was well known at Sokewan as a sailor on board the junk at the time she left, which the prisoner denies, stating himself to be a barber at Sokewan, where after a long absence, he had returned and been immediately recognized, and given into custody by the surviving members of the junk's occupants, who had returned to Sokewan.

The Attorney General first called Quok-a-cun, who being declared, said that she was a fishing boat woman, at Sokewan, and was a boatwoman on the 20th December last on board a boat with her father Quok in Shan, at Sokewan. That boat was on board at the time her father, mother, and six children, also two brothers in law. On the 20th December the boat left Stanley, to go out fishing. Her mother's name was Chow-a-lock. A boy named Quok-a-yong, aged 13, who was betrothed to her sister, another boy named Quok-a-tye, aged 7, also betrothed to another sister, and a girl named Amoy, aged three years, were with her. Witness also knew Quok-a-sing, who is ten years of age, he was also on board, altogether seven persons. Quok-hoy-kee is her brother. Witness knows Leong-a-cheoy, she is the wife of her brother. Witness did not see either him or his wife on board when the junk started fishing from Stanley. There were on board a crew of five men who left with them. The prisoner was one of the five men, his name was Apoo, but she does not know his surname. Witness had known the prisoner previously since August 1865. He was employed up to the 20th December as steersman, on board her father's boat. The boat left Stanley late in the afternoon, in company with another boat. Witness knows Lum-tu-chin, he was a boatman on board the boat in company. Her father's boat being a fast sailer soon left the other boat astern. The prisoner was requested by the father by what means not to go far ahead. At that time they had lost sight of the other boat, it being then between six and seven o'clock and getting dark, no land being in view. The prisoner, on being expostulated with by her father, struck him. The boat was steering west at the time with a fair strong breeze. Witness could see her father struck by the prisoner, who threw an iron bar at him, and afterwards the rest of the crew rushed on deck, striking him with the windlass bars and knocking him down on the deck. The mother of witness named Cho-lok, went up to the men, and begged them not to beat her husband, but was likewise beaten. Both her father and mother were killed and thrown overboard. Her brothers Quok-a-yow and A-tye were under the main hatch. Witness was so close to her father and mother when they were lying on the deck, that she could touch them. The prisoner and the other four men then threw them both overboard. That was directly after they were beaten down, she heard her father say, as he was being dragged along, "I will give up all, do not throw me overboard." Her mother also said something, but she was dragged away and thrown overboard, the prisoner assisting the others. Ayow and A-tye, who had both run away to the water. Witness saw the prisoner throw one of the children overboard. Witness and the infant, with Quok-a-sing her brother, locked themselves up in the cabin. Witness remained in the cabin for a day and night, when they were landed at a place called Chappoo, an island to the westward of the Lamma. Witness went to Chappoo, where she saw some relatives, and then made a complaint to the authorities. Witness remained at Macao till the new year when her brother Quok-hoy arrived. After witness left Chappoo she did not see the prisoner again until he was arrested at Sokewan. The prisoner was on board the junk to Chappoo, which she has never seen since nor either her father, mother, or brothers. They were all thrown overboard. Witness was employed as a boatwoman or board her father's boat.

By the Judge.—Witness and her brother remained in the cabin during the passage to Chappoo. Quok-a-sing was in the main hold at the time her parents were thrown overboard.

This witness, who appeared to be about sixteen years of age, gave her testimony in a very satisfactory manner and without much difficulty or hesitation.

The prisoner asked no questions of the witness, and the Attorney General next called Quok-a-sing, aged ten, a very small child, whose chin hardly reached

the jury again returned after a
sence, and recorded a verdict
of murder in respect
Choo-ah-loo, and also with
neglecting the lives of Choo-ah-
and his two children.

Mr. Whyte: No reason why sent
should not be passed on him;
leaving out of the black
evidence of death on the prison-
way, remarking that he had
y after a long and painful
which no one could

CHIEF LIBEL CASE.

Court this morning, before
J. F. W. Mitchell, Esq.,
proprietor of the *Evening*
and in answer to a sum-
mons by the Rev. W. Lobscheid,
out on complaint in the in-
on the 24th and 26th in-
well appeared for the de-
nounced his own

This is a summons for mali-
gancy; of course you need
not admit the papers produced.
Yes, I admit all that, but
ask Mr. Lobscheid—it is
his consideration—does he
in any particular part of
the whole of them? The
consequence, but I should

referred that he thought
take one paper first—the
I be for complaint to say
the papers produced?
Yes, I admit all that, but
ask Mr. Lobscheid—it is
his consideration—does he
in any particular part of
the whole of them? The
consequence, but I should

Before proceeding, I may
wishes the case to be
nearly.
There is this difficulty: I
power to dismiss or to
but not to punish in this case.
said he should be glad to find
had power in order that the
of future proceedings might
drainance 6, of 1862, section
have the power.

Yes, in cases which are pu-
or imprisonment.
said he should urge fine, for
his client be subjected to
litigation.
He would take it that de-
the publication, and di-
nificant to proceed.

being sworn, deposed: I am
s case. I am an ordained
established church of Prus-
moued defendant for writ-
ing a criminal libel.
Is it one or two?

If you take the whole con-
taining points which point
malice.
That is the point to prove.
The first is the paper which
principal libel. The second
points on the article. I pro-
s of the *Evening Mail*, one
one of the 26th inst.

Take the first paper. What
you complaint of? "In the
Pigs," your Worship.
Yes, that is the one. I
paragraph in it concerning
greatest matter in connection
(chiefly says) is the asser-
were intended for govern-
That commences the passage
I should like to read the

Is that the chief portion of
complaint of?
Yes, the passage ends with
greatest a curious parallel.
Court by the complaint—
greatest matter in connection
(chiefly says) is the asser-
were intended for govern-
That commences the passage
I should like to read the

Is that the chief portion of
complaint of?
Yes, the passage ends with
greatest a curious parallel.
Court by the complaint—
greatest matter in connection
(chiefly says) is the asser-
were intended for govern-
That commences the passage
I should like to read the

Is that the chief portion of
complaint of?
Yes, the passage ends with
greatest a curious parallel.
Court by the complaint—
greatest matter in connection
(chiefly says) is the asser-
were intended for govern-
That commences the passage
I should like to read the

Is that the chief portion of
complaint of?
Yes, the passage ends with
greatest a curious parallel.
Court by the complaint—
greatest matter in connection
(chiefly says) is the asser-
were intended for govern-
That commences the passage
I should like to read the

Is that the chief portion of
complaint of?
Yes, the passage ends with
greatest a curious parallel.
Court by the complaint—
greatest matter in connection
(chiefly says) is the asser-
were intended for govern-
That commences the passage
I should like to read the

Is that the chief portion of
complaint of?
Yes, the passage ends with
greatest a curious parallel.
Court by the complaint—
greatest matter in connection
(chiefly says) is the asser-
were intended for govern-
That commences the passage
I should like to read the

Is that the chief portion of
complaint of?
Yes, the passage ends with
greatest a curious parallel.
Court by the complaint—
greatest matter in connection
(chiefly says) is the asser-
were intended for govern-
That commences the passage
I should like to read the

Is that the chief portion of
complaint of?
Yes, the passage ends with
greatest a curious parallel.
Court by the complaint—
greatest matter in connection
(chiefly says) is the asser-
were intended for govern-
That commences the passage
I should like to read the

Is that the chief portion of
complaint of?
Yes, the passage ends with
greatest a curious parallel.
Court by the complaint—
greatest matter in connection
(chiefly says) is the asser-
were intended for govern-
That commences the passage
I should like to read the

Is that the chief portion of
complaint of?
Yes, the passage ends with
greatest a curious parallel.
Court by the complaint—
greatest matter in connection
(chiefly says) is the asser-
were intended for govern-
That commences the passage
I should like to read the

Is that the chief portion of
complaint of?
Yes, the passage ends with
greatest a curious parallel.
Court by the complaint—
greatest matter in connection
(chiefly says) is the asser-
were intended for govern-
That commences the passage
I should like to read the

Is that the chief portion of
complaint of?
Yes, the passage ends with
greatest a curious parallel.
Court by the complaint—
greatest matter in connection
(chiefly says) is the asser-
were intended for govern-
That commences the passage
I should like to read the

Is that the chief portion of
complaint of?
Yes, the passage ends with
greatest a curious parallel.
Court by the complaint—
greatest matter in connection
(chiefly says) is the asser-
were intended for govern-
That commences the passage
I should like to read the

Is that the chief portion of
complaint of?
Yes, the passage ends with
greatest a curious parallel.
Court by the complaint—
greatest matter in connection
(chiefly says) is the asser-
were intended for govern-
That commences the passage
I should like to read the

Is that the chief portion of
complaint of?
Yes, the passage ends with
greatest a curious parallel.
Court by the complaint—
greatest matter in connection
(chiefly says) is the asser-
were intended for govern-
That commences the passage
I should like to read the

Is that the chief portion of
complaint of?
Yes, the passage ends with
greatest a curious parallel.
Court by the complaint—
greatest matter in connection
(chiefly says) is the asser-
were intended for govern-
That commences the passage
I should like to read the

Is that the chief portion of
complaint of?
Yes, the passage ends with
greatest a curious parallel.
Court by the complaint—
greatest matter in connection
(chiefly says) is the asser-
were intended for govern-
That commences the passage
I should like to read the

Is that the chief portion of
complaint of?
Yes, the passage ends with
greatest a curious parallel.
Court by the complaint—
greatest matter in connection
(chiefly says) is the asser-
were intended for govern-
That commences the passage
I should like to read the

Is that the chief portion of
complaint of?
Yes, the passage ends with
greatest a curious parallel.
Court by the complaint—
greatest matter in connection
(chiefly says) is the asser-
were intended for govern-
That commences the passage
I should like to read the

Is that the chief portion of
complaint of?
Yes, the passage ends with
greatest a curious parallel.
Court by the complaint—
greatest matter in connection
(chiefly says) is the asser-
were intended for govern-
That commences the passage
I should like to read the

Is that the chief portion of
complaint of?
Yes, the passage ends with
greatest a curious parallel.
Court by the complaint—
greatest matter in connection
(chiefly says) is the asser-
were intended for govern-
That commences the passage
I should like to read the

Is that the chief portion of
complaint of?
Yes, the passage ends with
greatest a curious parallel.
Court by the complaint—
greatest matter in connection
(chiefly says) is the asser-
were intended for govern-
That commences the passage
I should like to read the

Is that the chief portion of
complaint of?
Yes, the passage ends with
greatest a curious parallel.
Court by the complaint—
greatest matter in connection
(chiefly says) is the asser-
were intended for govern-
That commences the passage
I should like to read the

Court, accused of complicity in a criminal
action, and I want to read this.
Mr. Whyte: No, no.
Complainant: But I must.
Mr. Gaskell objected.
Mr. Whyte: You have no right to read
without my consent, let me see the paper.
Complainant, (handing the document):
This will prove that Denys had knowledge
of what transpired in Court, from his own
paper.

Mr. Gaskell: Well, he does not deny it.
Mr. Whyte said the paper was a most ad-
dress to the Court, and again explained
that it was for the Court to interpret the
libel alleged.

Complainant: If I am accused of an act
of criminality, and I am acquitted by the
Court, is an editor to come forward
with a libel against me?
Mr. Whyte: That would be a fair topic on
which to address the Court.

Complainant: I stand before the public
as—
Mr. Gaskell (interposing): Are you not
agent for the Netherlands West India
Emigration Company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

Complainant: I hold powers, but I had
nothing to do—
Mr. Gaskell: You were asked, are you
not an agent for a company?

to-morrow or next year, or any other time,
and I applied to the Consistory of the Es-
tablished Church of Prussia, any production
of this paper would prevent the Consistory
giving me a living, and I should be thrown
upon my own resources, and my family would
suffer from this exposure, and on this ac-
count I ask the protection of the govern-
ment to clear me of any imputation of con-
nection with criminals in the commission of
criminal acts, for which prisoners have been
sentenced at the Supreme Court. It is on
this ground that I have instituted this cri-
minal prosecution.

Mr. Whyte presumed that defendant,
having admitted the publication of the
alleged libel, would call no evidence. He
(his worship) would take the papers and
read them over, and would give his judg-
ment on Monday morning.

Mr. Gaskell begged leave to say a few
words. He apprehended that the defence
in the Supreme Court, which he did not
admit, would be that the alleged libels
were but fair legitimate criticisms founded
on a case which had been before the public,
and that in his remarks the defendant had
not travelled outside the case. If the re-
marks were deemed prejudicial by the de-
fendant, that was to be regretted, but for
his (Mr. G's) part he could not, under all
the circumstances, see anything damaging
in the flippant articles complained of. If
complainant did think them anything, it
was the *Mercury* which had applied to
the *Mercury* had fitted the cap on com-
plainant, who had found it a tight fit, and
that it pinched him a good deal. A strong
article had appeared in the *Mercury*, in
which something was said about an "ap-
proach to the diabolic," but Lobscheid's
name had never appeared in the *Mail* article.
It appeared only in the extract which the
Mail had made from the *Mercury*.

Complainant said he was defending his dis-
tinction as a minister of a church. But there
was nothing in the alleged libel about a
minister of the gospel. A minister was
mentioned, but that was a sort of minister-
ambassador. Complainant was censured in
his coolie business relationship, not for his
religious duties. In pleading justification
in this matter, defendant would say that
what he had done was for the public good,
and certainly this kidnapping of coolies
was a disgrace and an injury to the
colony, and it would be a pity if the
public press were to be unduly fet-
tered in dealing with persons who had any
connection with it. There was nothing in
the articles that was not perfectly legiti-
mate, that could not fairly be defended before a
jury. He should regret, however, if the
matter were sent to trial, on account of the
great expense in which both parties would
be involved. Besides, the more Mr. Lobscheid
stirred in this matter, the worse it
would be for him. If the case got into the
Supreme Court, of course defendant would
put in several pleas to rip up the whole of
Lobscheid's dealings with coolies, and if
the case were dismissed by the Supreme
Court, Lobscheid's position would not be
so good as it now was. But he (Mr. G.)
contended that there was nothing in the
papers that would warrant this Court in
sending this matter for criminal informa-
tion. No doubt there had been some
animus between the parties. But that fact
must be discarded. There had been a
civilization by complainant, which had been
dismissed, each party having to pay their
own costs. Why, then, should Mr. G. not
say on this occasion, however, Lobscheid
had himself resorted to the press. He
had gone into the thing himself by writing
in the public prints, and in doing so, had
thrown the hatchet with some freedom him-
self.

Mr. Gaskell then left the case in the hands
of the Court.

Complainant wished to reply to Mr. Gas-
sell. Mr. Whyte informed him that he
could not claim a greater privilege than was
allowed to counsel.

Complainant wished to defend himself
against what was in effect a criminal charge.
Mr. Gaskell: Why did you not get a solici-
tor? There are plenty of them; though I
know that would not take your case.

Complainant: I ask for an adjournment
that I may obtain legal counsel.

Mr. Whyte: No, the case is now done.
You may appeal if you are dissatisfied with
my judgment. If you had applied at the
commencement of the case, I would have
granted your application. It now only re-
mains for the Court to see if this is a case
for indictment.

Mr. Gaskell: Will your worship see if you
can deal with the case summarily or not?

Mr. Whyte: Yes, I will look into that
point, and I will take the whole case. I
will give judgment the first thing Monday
morning.

The proceedings then terminated.

MISCELLANEOUS NEWS.

Fires were visible last night along the
crests of the hills south of Hongkong. Al-
though common enough at this season of the
year on the hills at the other side of the
harbour, we do not remember to have seen
the gorge on fire on this island and so
close to the town before.—*Mercury*.

Mr. T. W. SMITH, for some years inspector
of water works in the Surveyor General's de-
partment, was found dead in bed yesterday
morning about half-past six o'clock. He
had been sickly for some time, and the
immediate cause of death was, we believe,
disease of the heart.—*Ibid*.

The effective French blockade of the river
Seoul, leading to the Korean city of Kan-
g-ho, has already been notified. A conten-
pious says that "Kang-ho was in fact, the
stronghold of the once feared Korean kings;
and the fall of that place at once brought
the Seoul government to terms and to a
proper understanding of the requisites of
our time, in point of foreign intercourse.
The Admiral manifested hopes of a speedy
and satisfactory arrangement of the pend-
ing difficulties. We had this intelligence
with the greatest satisfaction, and trust
that, ere long, the civilized nations will
have a new field open to their enterprise.
The mysterious Corea will herself be bene-
fited, and the blood of a few most deserv-
ing men will not have been shed in vain."
Later intelligence, as given in another
column, seems to show that Kang-ho is
still a "stronghold."

The following melancholy accident, by
which an officer of the 25th regiment met
with death, is reported in a Colombo pa-
per. Yesterday afternoon (Oct. 29), a
fatal accident occurred which has thrown a
gloom over the 25th Regiment and excited
general and painful sensation. It seems
that the newly arrived Assistant-Surgeon
Evatt and Ensign Thompson were firing
at a mark in the room of one of them,

using Monte Christo pistols. Thompson,
we are told, had gone forward to raise the
target and in rising, his head came just in
the line of Evatt's fire. The bullet went
through his head and in half an hour all
was over. An inquest was held into the
verdict returned to the effect that death
was accidentally caused, and that no blame
whatever attached to Surgeon Evatt. From
the evidence given we extract the sub-
joined portions descriptive of this melan-
choly affair: "James A. Laurie, R.A. de-
posed—I was present. Dr. Evatt, 25th
Regiment, Mr. Forjett, the deceased, and
myself were in the deceased's quarters,
firing with a pistol at a deal box. I had
fired once and the deceased had fired once
when Dr. Evatt had loaded the pistol pre-
paratory to firing, and held it, as it ap-
peared to me, in both hands—the deceased
at the time standing to his left. The
pistol then accidentally went off—the de-
ceased dropped instantaneously." Ensign
Forjett deposed—"After Thompson fired,
he, Mr. Laurie and Dr. Evatt went into the
next room to load the pistol. When they
came back, Dr. Evatt took his place to fire
at the target, and the deceased was stand-
ing at the time at Dr. Evatt's left—I was
standing on Dr. Evatt's right, looking at
the target—I then heard Mr. Laurie exclaim
"For God's sake look out," addressing Dr.
Evatt, who, however, continued firing with
him. I heard the report of a pistol, and
saw Mr. Thompson throw up his hands and
fall."

We observed that Mr. F. W. Mitchell on
Wednesday morning took his seat on the
Magistrate's bench, and in so doing shook
hands with Mr. Cecil Smith. Upon enquiry
our reporter learned that Mr. Smith has re-
sumed his post as Registrar General, and that
Mr. Mitchell had been appointed to act as
Magistrate until the return of Mr. May.

The following prisoners tried during the
criminal sessions just closed were sentenced
Tuesday morning by Chief Justice Snaile,
as follows. Wong-a-kwei, found guilty of
escaping from jail and larceny, to imprison-
ment at hard labour for three years, seven
months, and six days, being one year in
addition to the unexpired term of his origi-
nal sentence at the time of his escape.
Amur Kahn, found guilty of perjury, six
months imprisonment with hard labour, and
Fazldeen Khan, found guilty of manslaughter,
six months imprisonment at hard labour.
—*Press*.

BANK RETURNS.
(From Saturday, Gazette.)
The following are the returns of average
amounts of notes in circulation, and specie
in reserve, at the undenominated Banks
respectively, for the month ending Octo-
ber 31—

Bank	Notes	Specie
Oriental	\$224,000	\$200,000
Chartered Mercantile	253,715	150,000
Chartered of India	29,100	20,100
Hongkong & Shanghai	650,334	350,000

The enlargement of the Reservoir at Poko-
lum is now nearly completed. The Bridge
to the North of Tiffin house may be said to
form the northern boundary of the new re-
servoir, which is thus about four times the
size of the old one. We may now hope to
have a plentiful supply of the pure element
winter and summer.—*Mercury*.

The North China Daily News notices the
following case tried in the Mixed Court,
Shanghai:—Jardine, Matheson & Co. v.
Tuk-sing. The plaintiffs brought two ac-
tions against Tuk-sing, one for Rs. 60,000
and the other for Ts. 20,000. In support
of the first, they alleged that certain car-
goes of the value of Ts. 60,000 had been
consigned to Tuk-sing, who had not fur-
nished them with account sales or made
any payments for them. Tuk-sing stated
he had sold one portion he was not certain
about, and the remainder was still on hand.
The Court directed him to pay at once for
what he admitted he had sold, and to get
from his books information respecting the
portion he

